

Message Text

SECRET

PAGE 01 SALT T 00141 051856 Z

50

ACTION SS-25

INFO OCT-01 ADP-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 DODE-00 CIAE-00 INRE-00

/026 W

----- 119943

O 051720 Z APR 73

FM USDEL SALT TWO II

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 1922

S E C R E T USDEL SALT TWO II 0141

EXDIS SALT

DOD HANDLE AS SPECAT FOR SECDEF

E. O. 11652: XGDSI

TAGS: PARM

SUBJECT: MEETING OF HEADS OF DELEGATIONS APRIL 5

1. MY 'HEADS OF DELEGATIONS' MEETING WITH SEMENOV THIS MORNING WAS MORE REMARKABLE FOR WHAT IT DID NOT CONTAIN THAN FOR WHAT IT DID CONTAIN. IN FACT HE BROUGHT UP ONLY ONE SUBSTANTIVE QUESTION AND THAT WAS A LONG STATEMENT, WHICH HE READ FROM NOTES, RENEWING THEIR

NON- TRANSFER PROPOSAL IN VERY CLOSE TO THE SAME TERMS AS LAST GENEVA

SESSION, EXCEPT FOR SPECIFIC ADDITION OF MENTION OF MRV/ MIRV TECHNOLOGY. (THIS, OF COURSE, OBVIOUSLY REFERS TO PRESENT PUBLIC DISCUSSION OF POSEIDON MISSILES FOR THE UK.) ONLY OTHER ITEM WAS ALSO A STATEMENT READ FROM NOTES EXPRESSING CONCERN WITH RESPECT TO SUCH " NEW" PROGRAMS AS TRIDENT, " B-1 A" (SIC), SRAMS AND SCADS ON B-52 S, PROPOSALS FOR INCREASED MIRVS ON POSEIDONS AND PROPOSALS FOR MIRVING ALL MINUTEMEN. IN THIS CONNECTION HE ALSO MENTIONED " ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR OTHER TYPES OF NEW STRATEGIC PROGRAMS, SUCH AS SLCMS CAPABLE OF HITTING LAND TARGETS." HE ACCEPTED MY SHARP REJOINDER ON ALL THIS WITH GOOD GRACE AND SHOWED NO ENTHUSIASM FOR PURSUING THE SUBJECT. HE ENDED UP HIS PRESENTATION WITH ATTEMPT TO ANSWER MY PREVIOUS QUERIES ON POINTS OF DIFFERENCE BY STATEMENT WHICH HE CHARACTERIZED AS BEING " PHILOSOPHICAL" AND WAS NO ANSWER AT ALL.

2. WITH RESPECT TO NON- TRANSFER STATEMENT, I ASKED HIM WHETHER
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 SALT T 00141 051856 Z

THERE WAS ANY SIGNIFICANT " NUANCE" IN HIS STATEMENT TODAY AS COMPARED WITH PREVIOUS STATEMENTS, WITH EXCEPTION MENTION OF MRVS/ MIRVS. I ALSO ASKED HIM WHETHER HIS STATEMENT COVERED DELIVERY VEHICLES AS WELL AS NUCLEAR WEAPONS THEMSELVES; AND WHETHER PROPOSAL WAS FOR IMMEDIATE AGREEMENT TO BE APPLIED TO THE INTERIM AGREEMENT OR WHETHER IT WAS FOR INCLUSION IN THE PERMANENT AGREEMENT. IN REPLY HE SAID THAT I HAD BEEN CORRECT IN NOTING THE ADDITION OF MRVS/ MIRVS AND THAT " IN PRESENT SITUATION THE MRV/ MIRV INCLUSION IN OUR PROPOSAL ACQUIRES TIMELY IMPORTANCE". WITH REFERENCE TO MY QUESTION ON TIMING IN HIS PROPOSAL AND RELATION TO INTERIM AGREEMENT AND PERMANENT AGREEMENT, HE SAID HE BELIEVED " IT SHOULD APPLY TO THE PRESENT SITUATION," ADDING THAT " ITS SOLUTION WAS TIMELY AND SHOULD NOT BE POSTPONED". HE CONFIRMED THAT PROPOSAL APPLIED TO DELIVERY SYSTEMS AS WELL AS TO NUCLEAR WEAPONS THEMSELVES. I SAID THAT, AS HE KNEW, THIS WHOLE COMPLICATED SUBJECT OF NON- TRANSFER INVOLVED RELATIONS BETWEEN OURSELVES AND OUR ALLIES, AND I PRESUMED BETWEEN THEM AND THEIR ALLIES, AND IT WAS VERY DIFFICULT FOR ME TO SEE HOW SUBJECT COULD BE DEALT WITH UNTIL WE KNEW WHAT WAS TO BE LIMITED IN THE PERMANENT AGREEMENT AND HOW IT WAS TO BE LIMITED. HE DID NOT PURSUE THE SUBJECT FURTHER.

3. IN RESPONSE TO HIS STATEMENT OF CONCERN RE " NEW" US WEAPONS SYSTEMS, I SAID THAT I FOUND SUCH A STATEMENT MORE APPROPRIATE TO A PUBLIC PROPAGANDA ATTACK ON THE US THAN TO A PRIVATE TALK BETWEEN THE TWO OF US. HE AND HIS GOVERNMENT PERFECTLY WELL KNEW THAT THE SYSTEMS HE WAS DESCRIBING WERE NOT " NEW" DEVELOPMENTS, BUT RATHER PROGRAMS FOR MODERNIZATION THAT HAD BEEN IN EXISTENCE LONG BEFORE THE MAY 1972 AGREEMENTS AND THEY WERE NOT BEING " ACCELERATED" BUT RATHER CONTINUING TO BE PURSUED IN AN ORDERLY MANNER. I SAID WE KNEW THE SOVIETS SIMILARLY HAD PROGRAMS FOR AT LEAST THREE NEW LAND- BASED MISSILES, NEW LONG- RANGE SLBMS, SUBMARINES, ETC., WHICH THEY HAD EVERY RIGHT TO DO. IF HIS PROPOSAL WAS THAT THE US STOP ALL ITS DEVELOPMENT AND MODERNIZATION PROGRAMS WHILE THE SOVIETS CONTINUE TO PURSUE THEIRS, I COULD ONLY CATEGORICALLY REJECT IT. IF HIS PROPOSAL WAS FOR A MUTUALLY BINDING AGREEMENT BETWEEN US ON SUCH A SUBJECT THAT WAS ANOTHER MATTER, BUT IT SEEMED TO ME THAT SUCH AN AGREEMENT WOULD BE EXTREMELY DIFFICULT TO WORK OUT. I WAS SURE THAT IF TABLES HAD BEEN TURNED AND I HAD MADE SUCH A PROPOSAL TO HIM, " HE KNEW HOW HE WOULD REACT AND HE KNEW HOW MOSCOW WOULD REACT." HE MADE NO REAL REPLY EXCEPT TO SAY THAT PURPOSE OF OUR PRIVATE MEETINGS SHOULD BE TO DISCUSS

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 SALT T 00141 051856 Z

ANY QUESTIONS EITHER SIDE DESIRED TO RAISE, AND THEN QUICKLY PASSED ON TO HIS NOTES ON THE NEXT SUBJECT.

4. HE THEN MADE WHAT HE TERMED HIS " PHILOSOPHICAL" STATEMENT, WHICH AT ONE TIME SEEMED TO START MOVING TOWARD SUGGESTING PARTIAL AGREEMENTS, BUT HE THEN SEEMED TO SKIP SOME PORTIONS OF HIS NOTES AND ENDED UP WITH A PANEGYRIC ON OUR " WORKING TOGETHER TO FIND POINTS OF CONTACT AND UNDERSTANDING" RATHER THAN " EMPHASIZING DIFFERENCES," THE LATTER BEING IN APPARENT REPLY TO MY PREVIOUS PROBING TO IDENTIFY OUR POINTS OF DIFFERENCE. IN RESPONSE I SAID THAT I HAD TRIED TO ANSWER HIS PROPOSALS IN A STRAIGHTFORWARD MANNER, CLEARLY SAYING EITHER YES OR NO, BUT IN RESPONSE TO THE SIMPLE STRAIGHTFORWARD PROPOSALS I HAD MADE TO HIM I STILL DID NOT UNDERSTAND HIS POSITION. FOR EXAMPLE, WAS HE OR WAS HE NOT IN FAVOR OF EQUAL AGGREGATES ON STRATEGIC DELIVERY SYSTEMS? IF HE WOULD SAY YES OR NO OR MAYBE, I WOULD HAVE A BETTER FEEL FOR THEIR POSITION, BUT FRANKLY HE " NUANCED" HIS POSITION SO DEEPLY I WAS UNABLE TO UNDERSTAND IT AND WAS ASKING HIM FOR HIS HELP IN DOING SO. HE ENDED THIS PORTION OF CONVERSATION BY SAYING THAT HE THOUGHT " I KNEW MORE THAN I WAS SAYING," AND IN FACT HE BELIEVED THAT HE TOO " KNEW MORE THAN HE WAS SAYING." JOHNSON

SECRET

*** Current Handling Restrictions *** EXDIS

*** Current Classification *** SECRET

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: Z
Capture Date: 01 JAN 1994
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 05 APR 1973
Decaption Date: 28 MAY 2004
Decaption Note: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: garlanwa
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1973SALTT00141
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: RR
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: SALT TALKS
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1973/newtext/t19730434/aaaahrbd.tel
Line Count: 143
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: ACTION SS
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: EXDIS
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 3
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: EXDIS
Reference: n/a
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: garlanwa
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 30 JAN 2002
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <30-Jan-2002 by collinp0>; APPROVED <14 FEB 2002 by garlanwa>
Review Markings:

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: <DBA CORRECTED> gwr 971201
Subject: MEETING OF HEADS OF DELEGATIONS APRIL 5
TAGS: PARM, SZ
To: SECSTATE WASHDC
SS
Type: TE
Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005